

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the pending claims and the following remarks.

Amendments to the Claims

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 7-8 and 10-16 will be pending in the present application. Claim 7 has been amended. Claims 1-6 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 12-16 have been added.

No new matter has been added by way of these amendments because each amendment is supported by the present specification. For example, the amendment to claim 7 and new claim 12 are supported by the present specification, *inter alia*, at pages 6-15 and Examples 19-22 as well as claims 2, 3 and 9 as originally filed. Support for new claims 13-16 can be found in the present specification, *inter alia*, at pages 11-13.

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Issues under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. '173 (U.S. 6,426,173). Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 9 have been cancelled herein, which renders the rejection as to these claims moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

As amended, independent claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “using a laser light with an emission wavelength selected from **405 nm and 375 nm**” (emphasis added).

In stark contrast, Shimizu et al. ‘173 disclose a laser light with an emission wavelength of 300 to 370 nm (col. 4, lines 13-16). Thus, Shimizu et al. ‘173 fail to disclose “a laser light with an emission wavelength selected from 405 nm and 375 nm.”

Therefore, claims 7-8 and 10-11 are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Shimizu et al. ‘173. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Issues under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. ‘173 in view of Shibuya et al. ‘541 (U.S. 2003/0077541) and Okazaki et al. ‘011 (U.S. 2004/0247011). Claim 3 has been cancelled herein, which renders the rejection moot.

Newly Proposed Claims 12-16

Applicants have added newly proposed claims 12-16 in an effort to further define the scope of protection owed to Applicants. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-16 are allowable for the reasons given above. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 12-16 clearly define over the prior art of record, and an early indication to this effect is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

A full and complete response has been made to all issues as cited in the Office Action. Applicants have taken substantial steps in efforts to advance prosecution of the present application. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance issue for the present case.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad M. Rink (Reg. No. 58,258) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: AUG - 1 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP


8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants

 #43575
for